A historic perspective on gendered role expectations and processes of exclusion in communication studies and how female scholars cope with them

Franziska Thiele

Institute for Media Research, University of Rostock

Abstract

Die Forschung zur Kommunikationswissenschaft legt nahe, dass es Ungleichbehandlungen von Frauen im Fach gibt, die das Ergebnis von geschlechtsspezifischen, generationsüberdauernden Rollenerwartungen sind. Ihre Langlebigkeit impliziert, dass sie im disziplinären Habitus reproduziert werden, der einen Mainstream vorgibt und zugleich bestimmte Inhalte und Akteure davon ausschließt (Bourdieu, 1984). Ziel dieses Beitrags ist es, generationsüberdauernde Formen der Ungleichbehandlungen, die mit geschlechtsspezifischen Rollenerwartungen und dem Ausschluss vom disziplinären Mainstream zusammenhängen, zu untersuchen sowie Bewältigungsstrategien von Wissenschaftlerinnen im Umgang mit diesen zu identifizieren. Empirische Grundlage der Arbeit sind qualitative Interviews mit Kommunikationswissenschaftler*innen. Es zeigt sich, dass geschlechtsspezifische Rollenerwartungen im Bereich der Lehre, dem Netzwerken, bei informellen Treffen und der Wahl von Forschungsthemen besonders präsent sind, während Formen der Ausgrenzung im Zusammenhang mit dem Verfassen von Publikationen und dem Übergehen und Ignorieren von Frauen in persönlichen Gesprächen zu finden waren. Es zeigte sich zudem, dass sich die Bewältigungsstrategien und somit auch der Feldhabitus über Generationen hinweg verändern und das Bewusstsein für Probleme zunimmt.

Keywords: *Geschlecht, Ungleichbehandlung, Rollenerwartungen, Bewältigungsstrategien, Kommunikationswissenschaft, Mainstream, Bourdieu*

Excluding women from academia has a long history. English moral philosophers in the late 18th and early 19th century would place females as subordinate to their husbands, whom they were to serve and obey and produce a great number of children, while looking as attractive as possible. Education of females was only supported in so far as it would help them to manage household affairs (Schuck, 1974).

In Germany, women's suffrage was instated in 1918 and barriers for women to access Universities were abolished in 1923 (Richter & Wolff, 2018; Riesmeyer & Huber, 2012, p. 11). While access to higher education was limited for women in the US before 1848, women gained suffrage on a national level in the 1920s (Harper, Patton, & Wooden, 2009). After this it seemed that intellectual equality with men was possible, if one could live up to their standards. In the following years academic women in the US worked very hard and some became more rigorous than their male counterparts, even though stereotypical role expectations still relegated them to the household and only 14% of the Ph.D's were female in the 1930s (ibid.). While especially the old and well-established disciplines were not very open for women and minorities, communication studies as a new field, had more room for them and was nationally more diverse with scholars having emigrated from Austria and Germany (Fleck, 2021).

In 1937 the Rockefeller Foundation funded a social research project, which was called the Radio Research Project, and was essential for the origin and establishment of communication as a discipline in the US. At the Office of Radio Research (ORR), which in 1944 became the Bureau of Applied Social Research (the Bureau), led by the Austrian emigrant Paul Lazarsfeld more than 50 women were employed, due to the fact that most of the men "the preferred labor force" (Rowland & Simonson, 2014, p. 18) were at war overseas. The women such as Herta

Herzog, Thelma Ehrlich Anderson and Hazel Gaudet Erskine made huge contributions to the establishment of the discipline. Even though women constituted six of the top ten authors by page numbers of published articles and research reports from 1937 to 1945 (Fleck, 2011), they were often erased from authorship and only credited as assistants (Rowland & Simonson, 2014). Disciplinary history was latter written as "legitimating myths" (ibid., p. 6) about the founding fathers of the discipline, cementing the exclusion of women by erasing their contribution to the establishment of the field and making them invisible.

We can still find similar processes of exclusion and marginalization today, 90 years later. Studies show that in comparison to other disciplines the field of communication is above average in regards to gender diversity in communication journals. But while women publish an equal amount of publications in the most prestigious journals of the discipline and are equally productive, women and men disproportionally cite men and the quality of a paper written by a man is considered to be higher (Chakravartty, Kuo, Grubbs, & McIlwain, 2018; Knobloch-Westerwick, Glynn, & Huge, 2013; Press, Verhoeven, Sterne, & Mayer, 2017; Trepte & Loths, 2020). Furthermore, Chakravartty et al. (2018) show in their paper *#CommunicationSoWhite* that "publication and citation practices produce a hierarchy of visibility and value" (p.257) in communication science, in which "institutional racism and sexism" (ibid.) are being reproduced and white, cis-gendered, heterosexual men are overrepresented. Although the majority of (doctoral) students is female their numbers decrease with rising status. A 2019 survey of German communication professors showed that even though 76% of those, who start studying communication are women, out of 198 professors, only 38% were female (Prommer & Riesmeyer, 2020). Similar results can be found in the US and around the world, where women are still the minority in the most powerful and best paid positions, such as assistant and full professors (National Communication Association, 2021; United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, 2021).

A study from 2012 on the fellows of the International Communication Association (ICA), which is said to be the most influential and prestigious association within the field of communication studies, showed that at the time only 18 out of 57 fellows, so about 32%, were women (Meyen, 2012). The fellow status is bestowed upon those, who are considered to have made a major contribution to the field or in service to the ICA. By 2022 the ICA had nominated 230 fellows of which 77 were women, which makes up 33 %.[1] So interestingly enough basically nothing has changed in the ratio of women that have been considered influential by their fellow ICA members in the last 10 years.

This raises the question, if we are just treading water at this point. In Western societies we tend to believe in progress and think that everything is getting better just because time is moving forward. But what if the situation for women especially in terms of unequal treatment, exclusion and disciplinary invisibility has not changed in the last 90 years since the pioneer days of the field, just like the percentage of female ICA fellows in the last 10 years?

Literature suggests that a lot of behaviours, that lead to unequal treatment, are the result of existing expectations derived from biases and stereotypes of both feminine and masculine roles[2] that are inscribed into people's minds (Bocher et al., 2020). Yet, gender roles are not only reproduced on the micro level by individuals, but also within the structures of social fields, in which actors have been socialized and acquired their field-specific habitus. Bourdieu describes the habitus as incorporated or embodied history. It is a mirror of the past and current identity of a field as it is the result of individual and collective experience, connecting the individual practice of the agent to the field and its history. Yet it also defines a disciplinary mainstream, from which certain content and agents are more easily excluded than others (Bourdieu, 2004, p. 35).

If we find mostly unchanged gender inequality

---

1 https://www.icahdq.org/page/Fellows, *last access: 01.10.2022*

2 *As expectations concerning gendered stereotypes mostly derive from a binary understanding of gender, this paper focuses on this perspective, although this is not in accordance with current discourses on diversity, where a person's gender is defined as having many different dimensions and can change over time.*

since the beginning of the field until today in communication studies, analyzing the agent's behaviour in connection to mechanisms of marginalization and exclusion within the habitus of the discipline, might offer explanations. As the habitus is passed on from one generation to another it might be able to help us analyze, why there is a lack of visibility of women in the powerful positions of the field of communication studies.

The goal of this paper is therefore to look at gender inequality connected to role expectations and identify different forms of exclusion that are found in communication studies today and can in most cases be traced back to the very beginning of the discipline. Those practices that transcend generations, indicate that they are inscribed in the disciplinary habitus. Knowing where these originate from, makes it easier to work on countermeasures, coping strategies or even strategies to change the disciplinary habitus.

In the tradition of Harding's (1999) feminist empiricism, which aims at making women more visible in scientific history using qualitative and quantitative data, the basis of this work are qualitative interviews, which were conducted by the author with female German speaking communication scholars in 2016, as well as with communication scholars living in the US conducted in 2019. These results will be compared with and supplemented by interview data with the first generation of female communication scholars in the US conducted by Naomi McCormack and Peter Simonson in 2007 and female communication professors from different generations conducted in Germany by Claudia Riesmeyer and Nathalie Huber between 2008 and 2010.

Gendered role expectations and forms of exclusion as part of Bourdieu's concept of habitus

The construction of gender and resulting practices of unequal treatment take effect on the individual level of social level of social interaction. Looking at them in isolation though, without taking into consideration institutional and structural mechanism of the construction and reproduction of gender does not offer much explanatory power, as people act as parts of and are embedded in larger social groups and systems, which influence them in their doing (Drüeke, Klaus, & Thiele, 2017; Villa, 2009). Bourdieu's field theory offers a theoretical framework, which allows interactionist research on binary gender concepts, focusing on the micro perspective of individual acts and motives, to connect these to the macro perspective of surrounding structures (Lünenborg & Maier, 2013).

In his field theory Bourdieu postulates that modern societies are divided into different social fields due to processes of labour division and differentiation. The fields operate mostly independent of one another and each has its own logics, rules and belief systems (Bourdieu, 1985, p. 11). In each field there are three basis capitals, that can be gained: social capital (networks), cultural capital (acquired knowledge and items displaying it) and economic capital (material resources). The three basic capitals combined make up the symbolic capital, displaying the reputation that someone has gained. Depending on the field a different composition of the capitals needs to be acquired in order to be successful (Bourdieu, 1984).

To fully become part of a field, agents have to accept its convictions and take over its beliefs by internalizing the field habitus, which links individual practices to the field. This happens in the process of field-specific socialization, in which participants learn about a field's modes, values and important capitals. After they have appropriated the field habitus, they instinctively choose from learned schemata in everyday situations and implement (learned) practices due to what Bourdieu calls the practical sense (Bourdieu, 1993, p. 107). While the habitus leads to a maintenance and re-production of existing structures, the practical sense makes their reproduction seem natural. Thus, given power structures in the form of unequal treatments and predefined categories connected to stereotypical role expectations and processes of exclusion are no longer questioned, but accepted. These unquestioned power structures and predefined categories within a field, that are the basis of unequal treatment, is what Bourdieu (1989, 2005 [1998]) calls the field-specific doxa. It designates the tacit recognition of power structures as "quasi naturally given" (Beaufaÿs, 2003, p. 253). When applied in

practice, the doxa becomes symbolic violence (König & Berli, 2012). It can come into play in language, lifestyle, a distinctive characteristic, emblem or stigma or even in the colour of the skin (Bourdieu, 2005 [1998], p. 8). In this respect gender is a social category, which is perceived as natural and therefore exerts a very strong form of symbolic violence (Villa, 2009, p. 123). According to Villa (ibid, p.8) the more natural a social category is perceived, the harder it gets to theorize it, which is why feministic and gender theories receive strong resistance as gender roles are equally maintained through the complicity of the ruler and the ruled.

In the scientific field we find stereotypical ascriptions of character traits connected to the "myth of the scientist", in which scholars are seen as developers, producers and inventors, who possess a natural talent to create (Engler, 2001, 459ff.). All of these are gendered stereotypes that are usually not attributed to women (Leslie, Cimpian, Meyer, & Freeland, 2015). Females are expected to be open, caring and take on more "nurturing" service responsibilities than their male counterparts (Engler, 2001; Hirshfield & Joseph, 2012; Pittman, 2010; Sztainbok, 2016).

But stereotypical expectation towards people are one thing, actually behaving as is expected, is another. As a matter of fact, research results show, that women also spend more time on teaching than men and less time working on their self-promotion as well as writing publications and dissertations, which are essential aspects in order to make a career in academia (Lind, 2004, p. 95; Prommer, Lünenborg, Matthes, Mögerle, & Wirth, 2006, p. 76; Zimmer, Krimmer, & Stallmann, 2006, p. 50). Around conferences and informal social gatherings women find it harder than their male counterparts to network and therefore are less well connected and less visible (Plümper & Schimmelfennig, 2007; Riesmeyer & Huber, 2012). Thus, it is not surprising that a female history scholar answered, when asked in an interview by Beaufaÿs, what it would take to be successful in academia: being "a man" (Beaufaÿs, 2003, p. 252). Because apart from gender-related role expectations and differing behaviour, research has shown that as soon as women enter academia as doctoral students they are affected by subtle mechanism of marginalization, devaluation and exclusion (Matthies & Zimmermann, 2010, p. 197). Their words are valued less than those of their male colleagues, their achievements more often doubted or ignored, their publications less often cited and their work credited less (Ross et al., 2022). Margaret Rossiter (1993) refers to the problem of women's marginalization in science as the Matilda Effect, in distinction to the Matthew Effect.

Research indicates that this has to do with the male dominated habitus of the scientific field. People, who become part of a field integrate it into their practical sense, thus displaying stereotypical (learned) behaviours. The habitus seems to offer individuals little room to manoeuvre, but actors are not entirely at the mercy of it and the field-specific conditions it creates (Thiele, 2021). First of all, people acquire slightly different variations of the habitus, some of which are better adapted to the rules of the mainstream habitus than others (Riesmeyer & Huber, 2012, p. 11).

Second, the habitus itself can change depending on prevailing power relations, central capitals and time-bound circumstances in the field (Zimmermann, 2000). Therefore, it is historically pre-conditioned, but also flexible since the field participants are communicating with and can influence each other and the habitus of the field. In fact, the field-specific habitus is constantly renegotiated among field members and influenced by processes of change in society as a whole as well as convergence and demarcation of one field with others. Yet, extensive adaptations of the habitus mostly occur in crisis situations (Bourdieu, 1984) and during generational changes in high positions of power (Wiedemann & Meyen, 2016). As more women are entering the field and achieve leadership positions, their chances to induce change to the habitus have increased. Yet, changing the habitus from a position of power is not as easy as it might sound, because people have reached these positions, because they have incorporated the previously established habitus, its rules and stereotypes well enough to be raised into them by their peers. As these strategies to change or maybe just overcome the habitus are difficult to implement, this is one of the core aspects this paper wants to investigate. As was described the habitus is in flux and

everchanging, but also connected to and a result of past events. In order to analyze it, it makes sense to find historical fixpoints and compare whether changes in unequal treatments connected to role expectations and forms of exclusion can be identified. This helps to gain a better understanding of unequal treatments and their interconnectedness to the field-specific habitus as well as identifying time overarching and lasting aspects of them. It also allows us to look at strategies that subvert or counteract the dominant habitus. How this shall be achieved will be explained in the method section.

Method: Qualitative Interviews

The empirical foundation of this work are qualitative interviews. In 2016 the author of this paper conducted qualitative interviews with German-speaking communication scholars focusing on career-related and media-induced changes in their scholarly communication as part of a project funded by the German Research Foundation. While the interview guideline did not include questions on gender differences, the topic was frequently addressed by the six interviewed female scholars and described as problematic in relation to their academic success. I decided to repeat the interviews with US-based scholars while including guideline questions on inequalities related to gender, national and ethnic background. The interviews were conducted in 2019 as part of a DAAD funded research visit. Interview data from scholars in the US and Germany was used for this paper, because many of the male and female founders of communication science in the US were Austrian and German exiles, but German communication studies is also strongly influenced by American communication studies and practices, for example, when it comes to publishing in English (Averbeck-Lietz & Löblich, 2017, p. 15; Bock, Borucki, Sommer, & Strippel, 2019, p. 177). Both countries are part of the Western-dominated disciplinary mainstream, which further supports a strong connection or even similarity of communication scholars in both countries (Thiele, 2021; Averbeck-Lietz, 2017). Although the academic system in both countries is not the same, it is very likely that

similar stereotypes and role expectations connected to unequal treatment and reduced visibility of female scholars will be found.

The interview partners in the US represent people in different stages of their career, gender, Universities, national as well as ethnical background in order to have a diverse sample and be able to look at different forms of unequal treatment of scholars (see Table 1).

The German as well as US scholars were recruited via emails, at conferences, and by using the snowball system. All six of the German interviews and ten of the 16 interviews in the US were conducted live and six in the US via Skype. Even though a lot of effort was put into recruiting an equal amount of male and female scholars, female US scholars were a lot harder to recruit, often mentioning a high workload as a reason, resulting in a total of four female participants. This problem in the recruitment process might have been a structural one. As there are fewer women in higher positions in communication science, they are more often asked than their male counterparts to represent the female community in scientific committees, round tables or the media, where they appear as quota women. This might be one of the reasons, why they more often rejected to do an interview, as they might not have seen it as an advantage for their own career.

Of course, this is not ideal for the sample as it does not represent the gender spread in the scholarly community and even less in society. Still, this was not the only goal as the sample was constructed to not only include female scholar's point of view, but also those of people with different ethnic and national backgrounds. The aim of the study to capture unequal treatment due to role expectations as well as forms of exclusion of different groups connected to the habitus is the result of female as well as male beliefs and behaviours. Even though those, who are who are more strongly affected by symbolic violence of the symbolic violence can report it a lot better, it was a self-selected sample. Therefore, this unequal gender spread in the sample was accepted and supplemented by the results of the interviews with interviews with the German female scholars in order to get a better look at the female point of view.

The field of communication science in Germany is small and questions about one's biography can be seen as rather personal, which is why it was seen as an advantage for the recruitment of the interviewees to anonymize the interview data. Although communication science is a bigger field in the US, as these were biographical interviews, it was very important to make the interviewees comfortable with talking about their biography, which is why the interviewees in the US were anonymized as well. This strategy was approved of by an US Institutional Review Board, as the US part of this study has undergone the ethical review process for education, social and behavioural science.

they first started studying at university using milestones of their career as an orientation. Although it was the starting point, the media usage was merely the ice-breaker, in order to get them to talk about changes within their field. This introduction was chosen, as it had proven useful in the German interviews to get the interviewees to talk about their career and describe the current (beliefs connected to the) habitus as to how to make a career in their discipline and get a permanent position. After it came follow-up questions about different stages of their career as well as to why they had entered academia in the first place, who had supported them and why they had decided to stay in one place or leave.

	Sex	Nationality Ethnic background	Position
GE1f	Female	German	Doctoral student
GE2f	Female	German	Doctoral student
GE3f	Female	German	Postdoc
GE4f	Female	Dutch	Postdoc
GE5f	Female	German	Postdoc
GE6f	Female	German	Professor
US1f	Female	American	Emeritus
US2m	Male	American	Emeritus
US3m	Male	Latino	Doctoral student
US4m	Male	Asian-American	Associate Professor
US5m	Male	Polish	Postdoc
US6m	Male	American	Associate Professor
US7m	Male	American	Professor
US8m	Male	Afro-American	Doctoral student
US9m	Male	American	Postdoc
US10m	Male	German	Professor
US11m	Male	American	Doctoral Student
US12m	Male	American	Professor
US13f	Female	American	Assistant Professor
US14m	Male	American	Associate Professor
US15f	Female	American	Professor
US16f	Female	Asian-American	Associate Professor

Table 1: Overview over the interviewees

Each US interview started off with an introductory narrative-generating question, in which the participants were asked to describe how their media usage had changed since

In a funnel-like narrowing of the questions, they were then asked a series of questions on what they considered as important factors to become a professor in communication

to further display the habitus in relation to career-related aspects. Here as well as with the introductory question changes in the field-specific habitus were described, as people would compare the past, when they first enter academia, with the present with the present. This has been done in a similar fashion in other qualitative interviews with academics (Beaufaÿs, 2003; Riesmeyer & Huber, 2012). In order to not steer the interviewees too much in that direction, questions on whether they thought there were career-related differences for people of different gender, colour or national background were asked in this final block, in case this issue had not been addressed before.

The qualitative interviews were transcribed literally following the rules by Kuckartz (2014, 136f.) and then coded using the structuring content analysis by Mayring (2010). The analysis was conducted by two student researchers, who used categories already identified in the qualitative interviews with the German communication scholars in 2016 and added further ones, such as the category of discrimination. The first set of categories were derived by doing a summarizing content analysis following Mayring (2010) of two interviews from the German sample. The first project with the title "Mediated Scholarly Communication in post-normal and traditional science" under the project lead of Dr. Corinna Lüthje also worked with Bourdieu's field theory and habitus concept as a theoretical framework.

As described before, the field habitus is incorporated and thus often invisibilized. Therefore, many practices of exclusion and appliance of stereotypes are not reflected upon and cannot be explained (Sander & Lange, 2017, p. 189). But when respondents referred to the use of unquestioned practices, they often uttered phrases like "That's what everybody does", "of course", "standard", "dominant", etc. This was made useful for the analysis as it enabled the identification of field-specific social practices connected to the habitus as well as strategies to cope with, change or subvert the current habitus of the field

The interviews, which were conducted in 2016 and 2019, were compared with interviews with five American women, who were pioneering female figures in the US in the 1940s, namely Gladys Lang, Joan Doris Goldhamer, Thelma McCormack, Yole Sills and Thelma Anderson. The interviews have been conducted by Naomi McCormack and Peter Simonson in 2007. Documents that were added to the analysis were letters from Herta Herzog to Elizabeth Perse, which were provided by the latter. All of these have been made available on the homepage outofthequestion.org, which was created by Peter Simonson and Lauren Archer as part of a documentary called "Out of the Question: Women, Media, and the Art of Inquiry". This data has been chosen for comparison, because not much interview data on the field-specific experiences of the first women in communication science is available. Furthermore information from 19 qualitative interviews with German female communication professors from different generations conducted by Claudia Riesmeyer and Nathalie Huber between 2008 and 2010 focusing on strategies to become a professor has been used to look for generational changes of the habitus in the German-speaking community (Riesmeyer & Huber, 2012).

Results

The interviews from 2016 and 2019 show a rather high awareness of the interviewed of interviewed of different inequalities in academia, in academia, while not all female scholars, who worked at the Bureau in the first days of communication studies, felt that there were any gender inequalities back then. This was rather interesting and indicates that the symbolic violence connected to the doxa of equality in the field has changed. But the fact that not all of the pioneer women reported this, might stem from different experiences or different strategies they applied in order to cope with the field-specific habitus. In order to get a first glimpse at these strategies, the results section will start off with whether the interviewed scholars experienced gender inequalities in their career, and if so, how they dealt with them. Afterwards light will be shed on different forms of inequalities connected to stereotypical role expectations and forms of exclusion and marginalization as well as strategies to cope with them, counteract or subvert them and the habitus connected to them.

Perceptions of gender inequality

Thelma Anderson mentioned in her interview with Simonson and McCormack (2007a) that women were "succeeding at the bureau" (p.14). They were not "being held down by the men and […] could succeed in whatever we wanted to" (Simonson & McCormack, 2007b, p. 13). Yet Anderson also described that getting ahead was a question of making the best of your opportunity and she felt that "for whatever reason, I didn't really succeed" (Simonson & McCormack, 2007a, p. 14). In a similar vein, Herta Herzog expressed in a letter to Elizabeth Perse that "[g]ender has never played a role in my professional life" (Herzog, 1994, p. 1). Joan Doris Goldhamer remembers it differently. In her opinion "men were at the top, women were nothing" (Simonson & McCormack, 2007b, p. 6) and did not get professional credit for their work. So apparently her experience was quite different from Anderson's and Herzog's. An explanation for this might be found in one of my interviews. Here a female emeritus (US1f) described how, when she first started as an assistant professor at a new University, she was the only female faculty member, who was not in administration, and for the first year was all by herself:

> I remember sitting in my office having my sandwich, you know, it - this is the naive part - never occurred to me, that that was a gender issue. Never. Instead, I remember thinking: "You know, these people, they just don't know me yet and when they know me, I'll be in the center of everything." And by the second year, I was in the center of everything. So, certainly, being personable and welcoming, you know, is a good thing, but that's how I've made my way during most of my career, behaving as if there were no gender issues. […] But […] as I look back on the landscape, it's clear that women were not [..] as valued. So, I think being overconfident was a plus.
>
> (US1f)

She saw herself as being naïve concerning gender issue and at the same time overconfident – the latter being a character trade stereotypically associated with masculinity. Like Herta Herzog she did not seem to consider that there were gender issues either. It is possible, that women, who were very successful, which both of them were, were equipped with similar character trades that helped them navigate the depths of the male-dominated academic habitus. Beaufaÿs (2003, p. 254) concludes from her interview findings, that the problem of the academic habitus does not consist of gender issues in themselves, but rather that the field is dominated by actors, who display a habitus that comes closest to that of a male scientist. When women were displaying a habitus that ignored gender issues altogether it prevented them from feeling alienated and leaving the field. So while displaying this habitus helped them to succeed, it also guaranteed the prevalence of the male-dominated habitus.

Inequalities connected to stereotypical role expectations and forms of exclusion

One of the female US scholars said that the core issues of and problems for inequalities within the discipline were "based on different expectations" (US13f). Especially those towards people's gender roles, as well as ethnic and national origin were described as problematic by the interviewees. The areas concerned ranged from expectations towards women in teaching as well as socializing at informal gatherings and choosing research topics, while forms of exclusion were found in connection to writing publications about marginalized groups, sexism, being talked over and ignored in face-to-face conversations. Different coping strategies were displayed in all areas, except for writing publications on marginalized groups. Each of those areas will be described in more detail below.

Teaching

In relation to teaching US16f remarked that students would react differently to white male professors than female professors (of colour). Several of the US scholars (US6m, US7m, US8m, US13f, US14m) traced this back to different expectations that people directed at women (of colour), like them having to be more open, friendly, or nurturing and doing

additional service work, such as "emotional labor of supporting students" (US8m). Similarly, a professor in the German sample thought that, because she was a woman, she would be "asked to do things that my male, especially older male colleagues won't be asked to do". Here gendered role expectations are at work, which are the reason, why female professors see themselves more burdened by administrative tasks and teaching activities than their male colleagues (Thiele, 2021; Zimmer et al., 2006). Though I could not trace them back to the pioneer days of communication studies, research shows that these attributed character traits and behaviours "are closely related to so-called female duties and virtues" (Zimmer et al., 2006, p. 50), which – due to societal standards, socialization and lingering outdated role understandings – have been frames in (Western) people's minds and habitus for a long time and continue to guide people's expectations in social interactions (Long, Jenkins, & Bracken, 2000).

Apart from the mere attribution, a German professor experienced that her female staff also considered teaching to be more important than her male staff, „which then automatically leaves less time for research - if I don't put an end to that" (GE6f). For this reason, she told them

> [...] to approach the matter very strategically, because otherwise, it can happen very quickly that you are distracted from research, publications and publication strategies by other things, and concentrating on these can be very ((both laugh)), very favorable for one's career. So, I don't want to imply at all that men are so much more strategic - I don't believe that at all - but I think that in our social world there are simply tendencies at universities that perhaps make it a bit more difficult for women to get fully into or to spend so much time on publication strategies.
>
> (GE6f)

What we see here, is what the professor Anna Maria Theis-Berglmair describes in an interview as a tendency of women to do invisible work and less reputation-enhancing tasks, such as teaching a lot, but

not acquiring third-party funding projects, which are important factors to be appointed as professor in the German academic system (Riesmeyer & Huber, 2012, 315f.). But even if they do manage to publish, there are other processes of exclusion that have to be overcome, as can be seen in the next chapter.

Research topics and publications

Looking back at the founding period of the discipline to „the Bureau", Hristova (2022) wrote that "commercial studies kept the bureau financially afloat and subsidized the academic studies" (p.655). She found that there was a gendering of two types of research, with females working mostly on commercial studies, while the majority of men worked on academic studies. So, while women were doing the work that kept the money coming in and wrote project reports, that would not get any scientific attention, it gave men time and opportunity to do research and write academic publications on topics of their choosing, which would earn them prestige and reputation. This of course had fundamental consequences for who became a visible scholar and remembered as founding people (Hristova, 2022).

We find a similar marginalization of women in research today as they are more often employed on short-term projects and men on long-term positions. Two interview partners (US11m and US13f) pointed out that female scholars (of colour) sometimes felt pressured by others to do research on issues related to gender, colour or "other stereotypical areas" (US13f) and that it was more difficult for them, when they did not do research on non-stereotypical issues. US4m mentioned the area of video games as an example, because "[p]eople will probably harass a female scholar if she speaks up on video games. Because, like, 'Oh, you don't know what you're talking about', because, apparently, girls don't play games and, you know, that kind of nonsense." In comments such as these, expectations towards gendered stereotypes acquired in the process of socialization and inscribed into the individual habitus play out. US11m considered "doubly diverse" people to have to struggle even more with this. A colleague of his, who was a woman of colour,

had to assert her position "as somebody who can do the same science everyone else is doing", but at the same time found herself "typecast" and pressured to do work related to her ethnic group.

But even when scholars did the kind of research, that was expected of them, US8m described that people would ask: "How is [your research] applicable to like, the larger group?" and US11m mentioned that especially research with samples of people of colour would have trouble getting published. A colleague of him experienced journal editors and reviewers saying: "Oh, your sample is not representative.", because his sample of people of colour was not seen as "the default science". US8m brought up that in order to publish in influential journals one cannot do "work that examines marginalized identities" as this would not be in accordance with the "white male hegemonic ideology" that they stand for. Scholars would then have to publish in other journals with a lower impact factor, which of course can have negative career implications.

If people do research on topics considered not important or at the periphery of the field they will not get cited or promoted. This is a display of acts of symbolic violence, as as journal editors are consequently excluding work about or by marginalized groups from the main discourse. As they are already marginalized by default, it is easy to legitimize the exclusion on the basis of the work not representing and thus do not belong in the disciplinary mainstream (Bourdieu, 1984, 1989). In this fashion, people are reproducing the same mannerisms that have dominated the field for years, while normalizing the exclusion of certain groups. Thus, the dominant habitus works as a self-sustaining and retaining system, in which the work of or about marginalized groups is being pushed aside and considered to be worth less (Chakravartty et al., 2018). Maybe Lazarsfeld and other people at the Bureau had this in mind, when they decided to disguise the women audiences that the Bureau did research on. Instead of openly displaying that people in the Decatur Study and others were mostly women, they used the "degendered language of 'people'" (Simonson, 2012, p. 1280) to generate an air of greater generalizability.

Sexism and socializing at conferences and informal gatherings

Some of the sexism existing in communication today can be dated back to the beginnings of the discipline. Thelma Anderson mentioned that there "was a certain amount of sexual play" as well as affairs at the Bureau (Simonson & McCormack, 2007a), while Joan Doris Goldhamer described that Merton, as he grew older, "would give us hugs and kisses" (Simonson & McCormack, 2007b). Dorsten (2012) analyzed the correspondence of Mae D. Huettig with her colleagues, who in the 1940s worked on the Motion Picture Research Project. In the letters Huettig applied mildly suggestive language and was referred to as a "little girl", while the tenor of the letters displayed "infantilizing" (p.32) female gender roles. To Dorsten (2012) this communication shows that Huettig, like all women at that time, was still a "female outlier" (ibid.) in the discipline and that the relationship of women with male colleagues was determined rather by gender than intellectual capability.

The female emeritus US1f in my interviewee group described that at her former department

> […] male faculty do not run rampant over their grad students and female faculty. But back then [when she first started], that was the case. People hit up on me regularly at conferences. And I just thought that was kind of funny, you know, I mean, truly, this kind of, of like 'who you think you are?', you know? (Interviewer laughs briefly) I mean, I just laughed it off. And so that happened. I never took it to a level where I said it was systemically, this is the problem, I should do something about this.
>
> (US1f)

While the words of US1f indicate, that things are better now, US6m described that female colleagues of him have been "harassed and or assaulted in their professional environments" and out of fear of running into these people at conferences they would go "to fewer of the cocktail parties and meet fewer of the people and have fewer job opportunities and the whole thing cascades" (US6m). So, sexism is a behaviour that is still present in the field

of communication studies and leads to the exclusion of women as well.

Informal gatherings at conferences where people casually talk with their colleagues generally seem to cause problems for women. According to the German communication professor Susanne Fengler at events like these, people's sociability is being checked out over a beer and co-operations informally discussed. Women would often refrain from those and retire after the official conference program, which puts them at a disadvantage (Riesmeyer & Huber, 2012, p. 313). Susanne Kinnebrock attributes this to the fact that it is more in keeping with a male habitus to be present at these social activities and women are less familiar with this form of informal business communication (Hey, 2019; Riesmeyer & Huber, 2012, p. 108). Like Doris Goldhamer described, before she met her future husband Herbert Goldhamer, of whom she had heard that he was a brilliant researcher: "I met him socially and I didn't want to say a word. I was sure I would pull a boo-boo or something terrible. So, I wasn't used to, you know, swimming in those waters."

That women have trouble networking at social events seems to be common knowledge in German communication science and was passed on to one of the doctoral students in the German interview sample. In order to not do the same mistakes as others before her, she made sure, that she visited social events, networked at conferences and took part in conversations during lunch or after presentations and "observed how everyone behaved in this aspect" (GE1f). She reacted to the information by adapting her social practices to counteract the "female" networking problem. Yet, during the interview she expressed that she was not sure, if this had really helped her case. Because, when asked about her experience and observations, she described:

> *Of course, you talk about these girls who go out afterwards [in the evening after the conference] - or you hear about them and they are the talk of the town [...]. Yeah, and then I thought: Is it really desirable or as desirable as it was suggested to me to be talked about in this fashion as a woman?*
>
> (GE1f)

So, while she tried to overcome a social practice considered to be typically female and not compatible with being successful in the field of science by adapting her behaviour, her chosen new tactic presented her with the next problem. As she is being judged and appointed throughout her career by people, who on one hand expect her to have a good network, and on the other to meet their gendered role expectations, being perceived as "the party woman" might not help her career-wise either.

Invisibility in face-to-face interactions

Another problem that was described by female scholars of the first generation, which continues until today, is that they and their statements are being made invisible in face-to-face interactions. Joan Doris Goldhamer said that Columbia University, where the Bureau was, was "not a good place to be if you were a woman. And it was not a good place to be if you were young, I guess, because you hadn't established yourself and nobody was going to pay any attention to you" (Simonson & McCormack, 2007b, p. 7). She remembered an occasion when Lazarsfeld was looking for a room and entered one, where she was coding with four or five other women, looking around and saying: "Okay, we can come in here, there's nobody here. [...] And that's how we were, we were nobody." (ibid., p. 6)

This example indicates that at that time women were not understood as equals and that the work, they were doing was not having the same value as that of Lazarsfeld and whoever he was taking to. Therefore, even though women were working in the field of academia, they were not understood as being part of it. As Engler (2001) describes it, they are standing on the sidelines in a game, that men are playing. The rules of these social games are drafted in a way that categorically excludes women, similarly to the socializing tactics, which the doctoral student in the chapter before described. But even today female scientists do feel alienated in the academic culture (Beaufaÿs, 2003, p. 234) and two different strategies, that women have applied in order to deal with this, could been identified.

In the interviews with female professors in Germany, which Riesmeyer and Huber (2012) conducted, the women described how difficult it was to find a place in the German Communication Association with its male-dominated "old-boys-networks" of which they were no part of. So instead of trying to force their way into these and playing by rules foreign to them, they created their own game and logics by getting their own division within the association called "Media, Public Sphere and Gender". Thus, they gave themselves a "place for exchange (that men had no access to)" and made it their social home, until they could enter powerful positions, where they could more easily induce changes to the field (Riesmeyer & Huber, 2012, p. 312). Today the field of communication science is more strongly penetrated by women, so it seems reasonable, that there are different ways and tactics, especially in face-to-face interactions that can be applied in order to break through a male dominated field habitus.

A female assistant professor in my interviews mentioned that junior women in her department would get "overtalked by one of the male faculty members" in faculty meetings. For this reason, "the women of the department came up with [..] a strategy for amplifying their comments" by saying: "I just want to get back to a point that [name anonymized] made earlier (US15f)." After changing institutions, she is now applying this strategy at her current university, where she became "the senior woman in the department" and is now in "this new position where I can control the conversation in ways that I couldn't before." This shows that it helps to have women and people of other marginalized groups in higher positions, to support others to break through the glass ceiling and ultimately change the habitus of the field.

Conclusion

The interviews show that until today the disciplinary habitus in communication science is male dominated and makes it harder for women and people of different ethnic or national background to be successful and get a permanent position in the field. The disciplinary habitus is influenced by societal stereotypes and outdated role expectations that show especially strong in the areas of teaching, networking situations and attributed research topics.

We also find processes of marginalization and exclusion of women and their work since the pioneer days of communication science. These revolve around women being made invisible by ignoring or overhearing them in face-to-face conversations and reduced reputational gain in the area of disciplinary publishing. In the first days of the discipline women would write project reports instead of scientifically groundbreaking papers or if this was the case, often not appear as authors, so they were systematically excluded (Fleck, 2011; Rowland & Simonson, 2014). Until today women are more likely to be forgotten as authors (Guo, 2015), though their inclusion in the scholarly field is less contested. Still, there are other forms of exclusion, for example women of colour are expected to write about marginalized groups. Yet, this lowers their opportunities to enhance their scientific reputation, as work on marginalized groups is more likely to be rejected by high tier journals as it does not represent the disciplinary mainstream. Thus, the disciplinary mainstream journals help the habitus to maintain itself. Also, women's work in other areas is more likely to be devalued.

Unequal treatment as a form of exclusion from the disciplinary discourse is more problematic than in the form of role expectations, because we are more aware of the latter. Therefore, we can come up more easily with strategies to counteract, while authors and papers that do not enter the disciplinary discourse cannot be made visible. Also, this was the one area where no strategies of self-empowerment were described by the interviewees in order to counteract. The only option here is to make people aware of this problem, so that, as reviewers, we can critically evaluate our own reviews in terms of whether the reason for a suggestion by us not to publish work lies within the quality of the research or its deviation from a learned norm with a topical focus that is just not considered to be part of the mainstream (which by the way groundbreaking findings never are).

It is of course easier said than done to dismiss or overwrite years of incorporated history,

which, as Bourdieu (1984) describes it, is not just acquired by one person, but passed on through generations in processes of socialization in communicable knowledge as well as in implicit and tacit knowledge.

Still people in the interviews tried and applied different strategies in order to cope with or change the habitus and a change in the strategies throughout time could be identified. The biggest struggle with these strategies was displayed by the doctoral student, who had been told that women sometimes missed out on networking opportunities at conferences due to leaving early. This is a problem, which especially young female scholars experience, who are that especially young female scholars have, who are still learning and trying to navigate the rules of the field. She aimed at empowering herself by going to all social events at conferences, but at the same time worried about the impression it would make. It shows, that women do not only have to cope with different forms of exclusion and expectations towards them, but they also have to invent new strategies to make their way into this alienating field. Therefore, it also seems likely that it takes them longer to acquire a field-specific practical sense than men, because there are less predefined rules for them (Bourdieu, 1993). Still, I will display some of them, which were described by scholars in the field.

The pioneer women such as Herta Herzog or Thelma Anderson as well as the latter born emeritus in my US sample, acted like there were no gender-based differences or were ignoring them, which is in accordance with the male dominant habitus. Another strategy that they displayed in the early days, was connected to the sexism at the Bureau, where Mae D. Huettig would take on the role of a "little girl", which is the other extreme of making the gender differences as visible as possible. Bourdieu (2005 [1998]) says that if those, who are dominated, are conform with what dominates them, they accept the structures of the doxa and submit to it. Still, ignoring differences and taking on the male dominated habitus or submitting completely to the role of the alien female seem like extreme yet fruitful strategies, when entering a field dominated by male habitus as pioneer women (Beaufaÿs, 2003).

Especially in connection to sexism displayed at conferences two other strategies could be identified: one was to shrug sexual advances off with a laugh as if they did not happen, the other was avoiding the situation, in which the women would have to deal with sexism or sexual harassment altogether by not going to conferences. While the first one plays into the strategy of ignoring differences (again showing a behaviour that seems well adjusted to the male dominated habitus of the field), the latter has far more severe consequence for one's networking opportunities, visibility and career opportunities on the long run.

Once there are more women in the field, they can form an ingroup and start creating spaces, where games are played by rules, which they make, that no longer categorically exclude them, such as the women in the German Communication Association did (Riesmeyer & Huber, 2012, p. 312). In opposition to the old-boys-networks they can also create supporting structures, such as whispering networks in face-to-face interactions, where they make sure, they are not being talked over.

While there seems to be a positive trend visible in the data, indicating that the disciplinary habitus has in fact changed in the last 90 years in relation to unequal treatment, exclusion and gendered role expectations, the data does not allow us to ultimately judge whether the essence of the disciplinary habitus is changing (for the better). Here more qualitative or quantitative interviews with female scholars from different generations seem useful. So, further research is needed, in order to look more closely at the development of the discipline and its habitus as a whole. On the plus side, the interviews showed that there was an awareness for these problems in the discipline not just among female, but also among younger (male) faculty. Though they have not found an entrance in the results section, many of interviewees said that they put a lot of thought into how inequalities could be reduced and described what they did to be the change, as they saw themselves as part of the problem. This seems like a positive outlook, because awareness can alter the habitus and hopefully this paper can help to make inequalities as well as coping strategies more visible and raise awareness further.

References

Averbeck-Lietz, S. (Ed.) (2017). *Kommunikationswissenschaft im internationalen Vergleich*. Wiesbaden: Springer Fachmedien. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-531-18950-5

Averbeck-Lietz, S., & Löblich, M. (2017). Kommunikationswissenschaft vergleichend und transnational. Eine Einführung. In S. Averbeck-Lietz (Ed.), *Kommunikationswissenschaft im internationalen Vergleich* (pp. 1–29). Wiesbaden: Springer Fachmedien. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-531-18950-5_1

Beaufaÿs, S. (2003). Wie werden Wissenschaftler gemacht? Beobachtungen zur wechselseitigen Konstitution von Geschlecht und Wissenschaft. Bielefeld: transcript Verlag.

Bocher, M., Ulvrova, M., Arnould, M., Coltice, N., Mallard, C., Gérault, M., & Adenis, A. (2020). Drawing everyday sexism in academia: observations and analysis of a community-based initiative. *Advances in Geosciences*, *53*, 15–31. https://doi.org/10.5194/adgeo-53-15-2020

Bock, A., Borucki, I., Sommer, D., & Strippel, C. (2019). Zwischen Kumulus und Curriculum. Bestandsaufnahme der Rahmenbedingungen für kommunikationswissenschaftliche Promotionen im deutschsprachigen Raum. *Studies in Communication | Media*, *8*(2), 171–202. https://doi.org/10.5771/2192-4007-2019-2-171

Bourdieu, P. (1984). *Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgement of Taste*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard UP.

Bourdieu, P. (1985). *Sozialer Raum und "Klassen": Leçon sur la leçon. Zwei Vorlesungen*. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp Taschenbuch Verlag.

Bourdieu, P. (1989). Social Space and Symbolic Power. *Sociological Theory*, *7*(1), 14–25. https://doi.org/10.2307/202060

Bourdieu, P. (1993). *Soziologische Fragen*. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp Verlag.

Bourdieu, P. (1998 [1984]) *Homo academicus* (2nd ed.). Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp Verlag.

Bourdieu, P. (2004). *Science of science and reflexivity*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Bourdieu, P. (2005 [1998]). *Die männliche Herrschaft*. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp Verlag.

Chakravartty, P., Kuo, R., Grubbs, V., & McIlwain, C. (2018). #CommunicationSoWhite. *Journal of Communication*, *68*(2), 254–266. https://doi.org/10.1093/joc/jqy003

Dorsten, A.-M. (2012). "Thinking Dirty": Digging Up Three Founding "Matriarchs" of Communication Studies. *Communication Theory*, *22*(1), 25–47. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2885.2011.01398.x

Drüeke, R., Klaus, E., & Thiele, M. (2017). Eine Genealogie des Konstruktivismus in der kommunikationswissenschaftlichen Geschlechterforschung. *Medien & Kommunikationswissenschaft*, *65*(2), 219–235. https://doi.org/10.5771/1615-634X-2017-2-219

Engler, S. (2001). "In Einsamkeit und Freiheit"? Zur Konstruktion der wissenschaftlichen Persönlichkeit auf dem Weg zur Professur. Konstanz: UVK Verlagsgesellschaft.

Fleck, C. (2011). *Transatlantic history of the social sciences: Robber barons, the Third Reich and the Invention of empirical social research*. London: Bloomsbury Academic. https://doi.org/10.5040/9781849662932?locatt=label:secondary_bloomsburyCollections

Fleck, C. (2021). Lazarsfeld's wives, or: what happened to women sociologists in the twentieth century. *International Review of Sociology*, *31*(1), 49–71. https://doi.org/10.1080/03906701.2021.1926672

Guo, J. (2015). Why men get all the credit when they work with women. The Washington Post.

Harding, S. G. (1999). Feministische Wissenschaftstheorie: Zum Verhältnis von Wissenschaft und sozialem Geschlecht (3. Aufl.). Hamburg: Argument-Verl.

Harper, S. R., Patton, L. D., & Wooden, O. S. (2009). Access and Equity for African American Students in Higher Education: A Critical Race Historical Analysis of Policy Efforts. *The Journal of Higher Education*, *80*(4), 389–414. https://doi.org/10.1353/jhe.0.0052

Herzog, H. (1994, September 12). Letter by Herta Herzog to Elizabeth Perse. Retrieved from https://web.archive.org/web/20220425201619 http://outofthequestion.org/Additional-Resources/Documents.aspx

Hey, B. (2019). *Präsentieren in Wissenschaft und Forschung*. Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer Berlin Heidelberg. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-662-53609-4

Hirshfield, L. E., & Joseph, T. D. (2012). 'We need a woman, we need a black woman': Gender, race, and identity taxation in the academy. *Gender and Education*, *24*(2), 213–227. https://doi.org/10.1080/09540253.2011.606208

Hristova, E. (2022). Research and Publishing at the Bureau of Applied Social Research: The Gendering of Commercial and Academic Work. *International Journal of Communication*, *16*, 655–663.

Knobloch-Westerwick, S., Glynn, C. J., & Huge, M. (2013). The Matilda Effect in Science Communication: An Experiment on Gender Bias in Publication Quality Perceptions and Collaboration Interest. *Science Communication*, *35*(5), 603–625. https://doi.org/10.1177/1075547012472684

König, A., & Berli, O. (2012). Das Paradox der Doxa - Macht und Herrschaft als Leitmotiv der Soziologie Pierre Bourdieus. In P. (. W. Imbusch (Ed.), *Macht und Herrschaft. Sozialwissenschaftliche Theorien und Konzeptionen. 2. aktualisierte und erweiterte Auflage* (S. 303-334). Wiesbaden: Springer VS.

Kuckartz, U. (2014). *Qualitative Inhaltsanalyse: Methoden, Praxis, Computerunterstützung* (2., durchgesehene Auflage). Weinheim, Basel: Beltz Juventa.

Leslie, S.-J., Cimpian, A., Meyer, M., & Freeland, E. (2015). Expectations of brilliance underlie gender distributions across academic disciplines. *Science*, *347*(6219), 262–265. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1261375

Lind, I. (2004). Aufstieg oder Ausstieg? Karrierewege von Wissenschaftlerinnen. Ein Forschungsüberblick. cews.Beiträge Frauen in Wissenschaft und Forschung; No. 2. Bielefeld: Kleine.

Long, M. L., Jenkins, G. R., & Bracken, S. (2000). Imposters in the sacred grove: Working class women in the academe. *The Qualitative Report*, *5*(3), 1–15.

Lünenborg, M., & Maier, T. (2013). *Gender media studies: Eine Einführung*. Konstanz: UVK.

Matthies, H., & Zimmermann, K. (2010). Gleichstellung in der Wissenschaft. In D. Simon, A. Knie, & S. Hornbostel (Eds.), *Handbuch Wissenschaftspolitik* (pp. 193–209). Wiesbaden: VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-531-91993-5_14

Mayring, P. (2010). *Qualitative Inhaltsanalyse: Grundlagen und Techniken* (11. aktualisierte und überarbeitete Auflage). Weinheim und Basel: Beltz Verlag.

Meyen, M. (2012). Der Machtpol des kommunikationswissenschaftlichen Feldes. *Studies in Communication | Media*, *Jg.,3-4/2012*, 299–321. https://doi.org/10.5771/2192-4007-2012-3-299

National Communication Association (2021). *A Profile of the Communication Doctorate IX:: The 2020 National Science Foundation's Survey of Earned Doctorates*. Retrieved from https://www.natcom.org/sites/default/files/publications/NCA_SED_Report_IX.pdf

Pittman, C. T. (2010). Race and Gender Oppression in the Classroom: The Experiences of Women Faculty of Color with White Male Students. *Teaching Sociology*, *38*(3), 183–196. https://doi.org/10.1177/0092055X10370120

Plümper, T., & Schimmelfennig, F. (2007). Wer wird Prof — und wann? Berufungsdeterminanten in der deutschen Politikwissenschaft. *Politische Vierteljahresschrift*, *48*(1), 97–117. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11615-007-0008-7

Press, A., Verhoeven, D., Sterne, J., & Mayer, V. (2017). How Do We Intervene in the Stubborn Persistence of Patriachy in Communication Scholarship? Advance online publication.
https://doi.org/10.17613/M6650Q

Prommer, E., Lünenborg, M., Matthes, J., Mögerle, U., & Wirth, W. (2006). Die Kommunikationswissenschaft als »gendered organization«. *Publizistik*, *51*(1), 67–91.
https://doi.org/10.1007/s11616-006-0006-6

Prommer, E., & Riesmeyer, C. (2020). Im Schneckentempo vorwärts. Gleichstellung in der Medien- und Kommunikationswissenschaft. *Aviso*. (1).

Richter, H., & Wolff, K. (2018). Frauenwahlrecht: Demokratisierung der Demokratie in Deutschland und Europa (1st ed.). Hamburg: Hamburger Edition.

Riesmeyer, C., & Huber, N. (2012). Karriereziel Professorin: Wege und Strategien in der Kommunikationswissenschaft. Köln: Herbert von Halem Verlag.

Ross, M. B., Glennon, B. M., Murciano-Goroff, R., Berkes, E. G., Weinberg, B. A., & Lane, J. I. (2022). Women are credited less in science than men. *Nature*, *608*(7921), 135–145.
https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-022-04966-w

Rossiter, M. W. (1993). The Matthew Matilda effect in science. *Social Studies of Science*, *23*(2), 325–341.

Rowland, A. L., & Simonson, P. (2014). The Founding Mothers of Communication Research: Toward a History of a Gendered Assemblage. *Critical Studies in Media Communication*, *31*(1), 3–26.
https://doi.org/10.1080/15295036.2013.849355

Sander, E., & Lange, A. (2017). Der medienbiographische Ansatz. In L. Mikos & C. Wegener (Eds.), *Qualitative Medienforschung - Ein Handbuch*. (2nd ed., pp. 183–198). Konstanz: UVK/UTB.

Schuck, V. (1974). Sexism and scholarship: A brief overview of women, academia, and the disciplines. *Social Science Quarterl*, *55*(3), 563–585. Retrieved from
https://www.jstor.org/stable/42860272

Simonson, P. (2012). Mail and females at the bureau: The happiness game in the gendered contexts of early US communications research. *International Journal of Communication*. (6), 1277–1289.

Simonson, P., & McCormack, N. (September 2007a). Personal Interview with Thelma Ehrlich Anderson. Retrieved from
http://outofthequestion.org/userfiles/file/Interview%20Transcript–Thelma%

Simonson, P., & McCormack, N. (October 2007b). Personal Interview with Joan Doris Goldhamer. Retrieved from
http://outofthequestion.org/userfiles/file/Interview%20Transcript–Thelma%

Sztainbok, V. (2016). Presumed incompetent: The intersections of race and class for women in academia. *Resources for Feminist Research*, *34*(3/4), 157-161,164. Retrieved from
https://search.proquest.com/openview/be47e969e62256ad6393b0ff9f7c3ce5/1?pq-origsite=gscholar&cbl=43888

Thiele, F. (2021). Kommunikationsstrategien zur Machtakkumulation in der Kommunikationswissenschaft. Wiesbaden: Springer Fachmedien.
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-658-35924-9

Trepte, S., & Loths, L. (2020). National and gender diversity in communication: A content analysis of six journals between 2006 and 2016. *Annals of the International Communication Association*, *44*(4), 289–311.
https://doi.org/10.1080/23808985.2020.1804434

United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (2021). *Unesco Science Report: The race against time for smarter development*. Retrieved from UNESCO website:
https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000377433/PDF/377433eng.pdf.multi.page=129

Villa, P.-I. (2009). Feministische- und Geschlechtertheorien. In *Handbuch Soziologische Theorien* (pp. 111–132). VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften, Wiesbaden.
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-531-91600-2_6

Wiedemann, T., & Meyen, M. (2016). Internationalization Through Americanization: The Expansion of the International Communication Association's Leadership to the World. *Global Media Journal German Edition*, 6(2), 1–23.

Zimmer, A., Krimmer, H., & Stallmann, F. (2006). Winners among Losers: Zur Feminisierung der deutschen Universitäten. *Beiträge Zur Hochschulforschung*, 4(28), 30–57. Retrieved from https://www.uni-bremen.de/fileadmin/user_upload/sites/zentrale-frauenbeauftragte/Berichte/4-2006-zimmer-krimmer-stallmann.pdf

Zimmermann, K. (2000). Spiele mit der Macht in der Wissenschaft: Paßfähigkeit und Geschlecht als Kriterien für Berufungen. Berlin: Edition Sigma.

FRANZISKA THIELE,
Dr., is a scientific researcher with teaching responsibilities at the University of Rostock. Before that she worked in projects on science communication and gender inequalities. In 2019 she was a visiting scholar on a scholarship at the University of Wisconsin-Madison. She did her Ph.D. on communication strategies of communication scholars to accumulate power within their field. Her work focuses on power relations, media appropriation, science communication and social media. Her most current publication dealt with scholarly communication practices on social media in times of deep mediatization.